1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332) United States Attorney			
3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division			
4	ROBERT N. MICHAELS (PABN 200918) Special Assistant United States Attorney Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law 1336 Plummer Street, Building 275 Monterey, CA 93944 Telephone: (831) 242-4537			
567				
8	FAX: (831) 242-5198 Attorneys for Plaintiff			
9	Attorneys for Flamum			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
12	SALINAS DIVISION			
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Criminal No.: CR-08-00126-HRL	
14	Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME	
15	vs.)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME	
16	JOSEPH M. SANTILLAN,)		
17	Defendant.)		
18		/		
19	On April 7, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status hearing. The			
20	parties jointly requested that the case be continued from April 7, 2008, until June 2, 2008 at 9:30			
21	a.m., in order to allow time for defendant's new counsel to review the case information. In			
22	addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from April 7,			
23	2008 to 2 June, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is			
24	appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.			
25				
26				
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCL CASE NO: CR-08-00126-HRL	LUDI	1 NG TIME	

2	SO STIPULATED:	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney	
3 4 5	DATED: 10 April 2008	/s/ ROBERT N. MICHAELS Special Assistant United States Attorney	
6			
7			
8	DATED: 10 April 2008	/s/ MANUEL ARAUJO Counsel for SANTILLAN	
9			
10		ODDED	
11		ORDER	
12	Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded		
13	under the Speedy Trial Act from April 7, 2008 to June 2, 2008. The Court finds, based on the		
14	aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested continuance		
	and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to		
15	grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for		
16	effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a		
17	miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made		
18	under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).		
19	SO ORDERED.		
20			
21	DATED:	HOWARD R. LLOYD	
22		United States Magistrate Judge	
23			
24			
25			
26			
20		2	
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXC CASE NO: CR-08-00126-HRL		